DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 103 717 CE 003 362

AUTHOR	Beltramo, Michael N.; And Others
TITLE	A Study of the East Los Angeles Youth Training and Employment Project.
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
REPORT NO	Rand-P-4958
PUB DATE	Dec 73
NOTE	41p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Disadvantaged Youth; Employment Potential; Mexican Americans; *Participant Characteristics; *Program Effectiveness; Success Factors; Youth Employment; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	East Los Angeles Youth Training Employment Project

ABSTRACT

Using a regression analysis technique, the authors produced a profile of clients, many of whom are Mexican-American, of the East Los Angeles Youth Training and Employment Project (YTEP), in an attempt to correlate YTEP participation with probable later success. In addition to data from an earlier Rand survey of 7,659 clients, YTEP collected program data from 229 of 501 sampled. Results were considered low in predictive value because of (1) the questionnaire method, and (2) the size of the population sample. Findings from the questionnaire responses are tabulated and discussed in detail. Analysis of independent variables (age, sex, education, time since client last attended YTEP, and length of stay in YTEP) led to the conclusion that clients who had the greatest amount of education and who spent the longest time in YTEP had the highest probability of success. It was not possible to determine from the results which aspect of the YTEP program to emphasize. The report also recommended that poverty programs have their own data collection systems and exercise quality control in them. (MDW)

ED103717

JAN 16 1975

CE

A STUDY OF THE EAST LOS ANGELES YOUTH TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT PROJECT

Michael N. Beltramo, Morton B. Berman,

Grace M. Carter

December 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

P-4958

OEO03362

The Rand Paper Series

Papers are issued by The Rand Corporation as a service to its professional staff. Their purpose is to facilitate the exchange of ideas among those who share the author's research interests; Papers are not reports prepared in fulfillment of Rand's contracts or grants. Views expressed in a Paper are the author's own, and are not necessarily shared by Rand or its research sponsors.

The Rand Corporation
Santa Monica, California 90406

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

I. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION 1
A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE YTEP 1
PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY, GOALS, AND SERVICES 3
YTEP OPERATIONS 5
PROBLEMS OF EVALUATION MANPOWER PROGRAMS 6

II. THE DATA BASE 9
DATA COLLECTED BY YTEP 9
DATA COLLECTED BY QUESTIONNAIRE 10
A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE TOTAL YTEP POPULATION AND THE QUESTIONNAIRE SAMPLE 11
Comparison of Age at Entry 12
Comparison of the Number of Services Provided by YTEP 13
Comparison of Classes Attended 15
Comparison of Length of Stay in YTEP 15
Conclusions and Recommendations 18
SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE 18

III. DETERMINING HOW PARTICIPATING IN YTEP CORRELATES WITH SUCCESS 23
THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES 23
THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES 24

IV. RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION 27
VARIABLES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO SUCCESS 27
Age at Time of Interview 27
Sex 30
Education 30
Time Since YTEP 30
Length of Stay in YTEP 30
Client's Perception of the Benefits of YTEP 31
CONCLUSIONS 32

V. SUMMARY 33

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Title	
1	Age Entered YTEP.	12
2	Number of YTEP Services Provided.	14
3	Number of Clients Who Attended Classes.	15
4	Length of Stay in YTEP.	16
5	Client's Age at Time of Interview	19
6	What Was Last Grade Completed in School?.	19
7	Why Stopped Attending YTEP Classes.	20
8	16-19 Year-Olds in the Labor Force.	22
9	Are You Currently Working?.	22
10	Relation of Variables to Success.	28
11	Relation of Variables to Working.	29

PREFACE

The objectives of this paper are to provide a profile of clients of the East Los Angeles Youth Training and Employment Project (YTEP) and to determine whether participating in YTEP correlates with success later achieved by the client.

This study uses data collected from two sources: One is program data collected by YTEP, the other is data from a survey taken by Rand and used in an unpublished RM (RM-5744-OEO, *An Analysis of East Los Angeles YTEP Follow-up Data*).

This paper also discusses the structure and policies of the war on poverty at the local and federal levels by providing a brief discussion of YTEP's history and environment.

I. BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

A BRIEF HISTORY OF YTEP

The East Los Angeles Youth Training and Employment Project was established in 1963 as the Youth Opportunities Board (YOB). Originally funded entirely by the Department of Labor, it was the first federally funded anti-poverty project to operate in Los Angeles County.

The Economic Opportunity Act which created the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) was passed in 1964. The Community Action Agency (CAA) concept is an important part of this act. A CAA is charged with the authority of disbursing federal anti-poverty funds at the local level. It is also responsible for monitoring the programs it funds to determine that they are complying with the law and that they are pursuing the goals specified in the proposal they submitted to be funded.

The YOB became the CAA for the County of Los Angeles for a brief period; however, the Community Action Agency portion of the YOB was soon spun-off and became the Economic Youth Opportunities Agency of Greater Los Angeles (EYOA). The remaining manpower portion became the YTEP, a semi-autonomous agency under EYOA.

The EYOA is governed by a Board of Directors composed of representatives of four major political entities within Los Angeles County (the "joint powers" which include: the City of Los Angeles, the County of Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Unified School District and the Los Angeles County School District), as well as representatives of the poor, who are elected by the poor themselves, and representatives of other community interests such as organized labor and charities.

The primary function of the board is to determine how OEO funds should be allocated to most effectively combat poverty within Los Angeles County. A significant portion of these funds were allocated to YTEP and its "companion project", the South Central Youth Training and Employment Project.

These projects were administered directly by EYOA until 1967 when

OEO ordered that they be placed under "delegate agencies" who would be established, independent agencies charged with administering the program. The idea was that EYOA should not monitor an agency for which its board was directly responsible.

At that time, delegate agencies were generally composed of old-line service agencies with a history of working with the poor and included: the Volunteers of America, the United Way, the Catholic Archdiocese, and the YWCA among others. No such agency was willing to administer the YTEP programs because of their size (about $1,000,000 per year each) and their political significance (both had become "hot potatoes" as questions were raised regarding their administration and effectiveness). Nor did any of the established agencies have the "grass roots" contacts within the areas served by these programs required to effectively administer them in the spirit of the Economic Opportunity Act. Thus, EYOA requested and obtained OEO permission to establish two new delegate agencies which were composed of people residing and/or employed in the communities served by the YTEPs. This was contrary to OEO policy which required that delegate agencies have a history of successful program operation prior to being funded by OEO.

United Community Efforts, Inc. (UCE) was established to administer the East L.A. YTEP. It was composed of people of good will but little experience who, generally speaking, had the best interests of the community at heart but became involved in petty politics and infighting thereby acting as a deterrent rather than an aid to sound program management. For example, members of the UCE board demanded that job titles, descriptions and salaries be identical to those of the South Central YTEP, thereby eliminating flexibility for creating a program around positions that would be capable of meeting the specific needs of their community. Although the capabilities of the board members of this agency have improved somewhat over time, it has actually never become an effective aid to the program which is, in fact, directed by its staff, or more precisely, by the project director who selects ("recommends") who will sit on the board of directors whose function is to advise and direct him and to critically review the program.

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY, GOALS, AND SERVICES

In establishing the multi-level structure of the war on poverty, it was the intent of the Economic Opportunity Act that the Office of Economic Opportunity establish national and regional policies in the war on poverty and that the Community Action Agencies would determine the needs of a local area. Delegate agencies that propose to meet the needs established by the CAA are selected to conduct individual projects. Two things are required of the delegate agencies. The first is that they have thorough knowledge of the community they serve and the second is that they possess a degree of expertise regarding the type of program they propose to operate.

Therefore, it is expected that United Community Efforts, Inc. have a thorough understanding of the target population it is to serve within the East Los Angeles community and have the ability to effectively conduct a manpower/community action program within that community.

Because of the Watts riot in 1965 and the notoriety given to that community, it is assumed by many, including some OEO officials, that Watts is the main stronghold of poverty in Los Angeles County and East Los Angeles was not given a fair share of the funds. Available data indicate that the residents of the East Los Angeles area are considerably worse off than the residents of Watts. The great majority of residents in East Los Angeles are Mexican-American, although there are many blacks and poor whites, while the residents of Watts are nearly exclusively Negro. The Urban Employment Survey conducted in East and South Central Los Angeles by the Department of Labor allows one to compare Negroes with those having a Spanish surname (primarily Mexican-Americans). The median education for Negroes was 11.8 years of schooling, substantially more than the median of 9.2 years for those with a Spanish surname. The median weekly compensation of male Negroes who were employed was higher ($131) than for those with a Spanish surname ($114). However, the unemployment rate among Negroes was much higher (16.2 percent vs. 6.1 percent) and resulted in a lower annual income for Negro families ($5,600 vs. $6,500).

It is within this environment that the YTEP exists. Despite the

numerous problems that must be attacked, the goals of the Youth Training and Employment Project are nowhere clearly defined and may only be inferred. The main thrust of the program is to prepare youths (age 16 to 22), who are poor according to OEO criteria, for work and to help them find a job. However, other aspects of the program are also quite important.

Some OEO and EYOA officials have indicated that the main goal of YTEP is not really developing the ability of its clients to obtain and hold a job but, rather, to train a minority elite of professionals and supervisory personnel--the program staff--to find suitable high level positions in government employment or private industry at the conclusion of the war on poverty. If nothing else, this theory explains the low level of the staff's qualifications and abilities. Monitoring by EYOA has indicated that people hired often do not meet the minimum qualifications (education and experience) indicated in the job description for the position they fill.

The community action facet of the program attempts to involve community people in helping "their" youths and, thereby, in becoming more interested in the community and its collective well-being.

The non-federal share-funding requirement is a cornerstone of the community action aspect of OEO programs. By law, OEO may fund up to a maximum of 80 percent of a project. The project's delegate agency is responsible for obtaining either cash or in-kind contributions to make up the remaining 20 percent of the proposed program budget. Cash is almost impossible to obtain in a poverty neighborhood, therefore, in-kind contribution is stressed in making up the non-federal share. This includes the donation of services, supplies and facilities. For example, community volunteers provide maintenance, tutoring or medical services, facilities for the program to be conducted in, or equipment and supplies required for the program. These contributions are given a value in accordance with guidelines specified by the Government Accounting Office. Theoretically, if the delegate agency does not contribute 20 percent of the funds it is in danger of having its program discontinued. However,

in practice, agencies rarely obtain the required 20 percent and are not punished for this failure.

YTEP OPERATIONS

The statement of work contained in the contract between the Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency of Greater Los Angeles and United Community Efforts, Inc. specifies the services that the YTEP will provide. During one year, the YTEP program is committed to serve at least 1,800 people between the ages of 16 and 22 who reside within the East Los Angeles and Whittier health districts and are shown by standard tests to have limited educational achievements and who lack motivation and who are out of school, unemployed, and unskilled.

The YTEP is to recruit these youths with the assistance of other youth-serving community agencies, test them, and assign them to vocational counsellors who are responsible for guidance and counselling.

The program is quite similar to the non-resident Job Corps with the exception that it is tailored to the individual. For example, whereas all Job Corps participants are required to take the same amount of basic skills and vocational training, YTEP operates on an as-needed basis.

Specific services it offers include basic skills education which is designed to enable enrollees to obtain the reading, writing and arithmetic required for most jobs and, hopefully, a high school graduate equivalency degree. It also provides pre-vocational training for a variety of skills including, among others: automotive, clerical, duplicating equipment operation and medical assistance; and provides work experience through On-the-Job Training (OJT), and Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC) programs which are funded by the Department of Labor.

The statement of work has been changed only slightly from that which was in effect when the program began and funding for the program has remained at approximately the same level. Both of these are facts of political life and are not based on a pragmatic evaluation as to how the program was conducted and its place within the total war on poverty within the County of Los Angeles.

Although an organization chart would indicate that authority flows from the Office of Economic Opportunity, through the community action agency to the delegate agency, in practice the opposite is quite often true because the delegate agencies are able to obtain the support of a prominent local politician who will exert pressure at both the local and national levels to keep it from being "tampered with." Therefore, it is quite likely that a study of a delegate agency conducted for the Office of Economic Opportunity would have no effect on the future program of the delegate agency regardless of its results unless political forces are identified and dealt with.

PROBLEMS OF EVALUATION MANPOWER PROGRAMS

Even if strong political forces did not exist that would prevent evaluations from being considered and acted upon at top policy levels manpower programs have characteristics that make them difficult, if not impossible, to evaluate satisfactorily. The ideal measure of a manpower training program would be to determine the net increase in a participant's subsequent income attributable to the training. Since this is clearly impossible without a crystal ball, the best substitute is to use a control group of individuals who are similar to the program participants in all respects except for having participated in the program. Such a control group cannot be established, however, because it requires that some potential trainees be barred arbitrarily from training and public officials will not authorize this.

Thus, in the absence of a true control group, several alternatives have been tried, including: substituting for a true control group individuals who signed up for the program but failed to enter it, or individuals who stayed in the program only for a short time, or individuals with similar backgrounds who for one reason or another did not sign up for the training. Using these substitutes has several problems, the most significant of which is the self-selection problem: because one group chose to enter a program and a control group chose not to, the two groups may differ in systematic yet unmeasurable ways. Another alternative, before and after comparisons of participants is often unsatisfactory because changes might have occurred without the program.

Quantification problems also exist in evaluating manpower programs in that all program benefits cannot be reflected in readily measurable terms. Therefore, benefits such as improvement in self-image, access to public services because of better knowledge, less alienation, better health and improved reading may be overlooked. This raises the problem of how multiple objectives of the program should be weighed and measured.

Still another problem in evaluating manpower programs is the fact that their goals are usually long-run. That is, their administrators believe it is not as important that their client have a job one month after he leaves the program as it is that he is well employed ten or more years after participating in the program so that the "cycle of poverty" may be broken. The evaluator must make do with proxy measures that can be collected soon after the client leaves the program. The confidence one may have in those measures depends upon the confidence he has in theories which link the proxies, or short-run effects, with longer-run goals.

There are two broad types of evaluation strategies. The first, process evaluation, addresses the question: given the existence of the program, is it being run honestly and administered efficiently? This is a primary function of the CAA and includes maintaining a check on management functions, and determining whether accurate records are being kept.

The second type of evaluation is outcome evaluation. The possibility exists that an outcome evaluation may declare a project a success or a failure irrespective of how well it is being administered. In RM-5743-OEO, Tom Glennan, Jr., has broken down outcome evaluations into two categories: impact-only evaluations and impact-plus evaluations.

Impact-only evaluations are designed solely to determine whether or not a program is having effects along relevant outcome dimensions. These are relatively easy to conduct because they investigate only a single hypothesis. They are politically volatile, however, because of their go/no go quality. That is, they have little capacity to point out directions in which the program should be changed to improve its

effectiveness if indeed it proves ineffective. However, this type of evaluation is difficult for program managers to ignore because of the straightforwardness of its conclusions.

Impact-plus evaluations examine a wider range of questions, such as what is working for whom and, therefore, requires more time to conduct. The additional hypotheses to be tested mean that larger sample sizes are required. Also, results are more equivocal and subject to many different interpretations and hence are likely to be more politically acceptable but possibly less effective in producing change.

The choice between the two types of designs, or more properly along the continuum between the two types of designs, should depend upon the particular case. Regardless of which type of evaluation is selected, however, a commitment in advance on the parts of administrators or other practitioners to action based on whichever of the alternative potential outcomes in fact occurs. Without such commitment it becomes too easy to brush aside disappointing results.

II. THE DATA BASE

YTEP is an interesting and significant program because of its uniqueness and size. It is also a difficult one to evaluate for the reasons given previously, among others. Our study uses data from two sources: (1) data collected by YTEP on its clients and; (2) data from a questionnaire given by personal interview to a sample of YTEP clients.

DATA COLLECTED BY YTEP

YTEP collects data on its clients when they enroll and during their affiliation with the program. Data were available for 7,689 clients who enrolled in YTEP between September 1963 and September 1968. These data are currently stored on magnetic tape maintained by The Rand Corp.*

The following information is contained in this data base:

- Name
- Birthdate
- Social security number
- Maiden name
- Client enrollment date
- Client case number
- Agency identification number (usually ELA-YTEP but some other agencies are represented)
- Date of last contact (the best estimate of the date that the client terminated the program)
- Reason for termination
- A listing of all services provided by YTEP

These services fit into three broad categories: (1) subsidized programs, (2) training, and (3) job referral. Each service provided is identified and a start and stop date and the reason for termination are

*Formats of the tape are in the records of the data management group of the Rand Computation Center. The tape number is K1120.000984.

indicated. In addition, there is information on the number of hours worked per week and the hourly wage for the subsidized programs and job referrals.

The data are difficult to analyze since a large amount is missing or incomplete. Fifteen percent of the 7,689 records had neither a birthdate or a date of enrollment. Thirty-five percent of the data up to one year before the end of the file had neither an enrollment date nor a completion date (the period of one year prior to the end of the program was selected to minimize the number of records that would have no completion date because the clients were still enrolled in the program). No services were indicated for forty-five percent of the clients.

While we consider the quality of the data to be marginal, it has vastly improved over time. For the last year of the file, ages and start dates were available for ninety-nine percent of the clients.

We are encouraged to learn, through personal communications with Don Clarke, the Director of Data Services for YTEP, that more comprehensive information has been included in YTEP data collected since 1968. These new data will be of importance for the analysis of YTEP programs. They include such additional, relevant items as: sex, race, birthplace, citizenship, physical, emotional and family characteristics, family income, conviction record, aptitude and intelligence test scores and counselling profile.

DATA COLLECTED BY QUESTIONNAIRE

A questionnaire was used to collect information on client characteristics and the efficacy of YTEP for the Rand study of YTEP which was funded by OEO. Indigenous interviewers from the same peer group as the clients and with strong positive attitudes toward community action were used. They were trained extensively to administer a comprehensive questionnaire to a random selection of YTEP clients.

The questionnaire included a large variety of questions aimed at determining the sociological, economic and education characteristics of the client. In addition, questions were included regarding services and counselling provided by and attitudes resulting from YTEP.

The 501 clients included in the sample were selected from all those enrolled in YTEP between June 1966 and July 1967. Unfortunately, completed questionnaires were obtained from only 229 of the original sample. There were several reasons for the low percentage of responses. The most important and the number of times they were given are the following:

Could not locate	- 146
Could not identify	- 34
Could not complete interview	- 26
In jail	- 25
In the military	- 13

The quality of these data will be more thoroughly explored in later sections. However, we would like to make some general comments on the questionnaire technique. Many of those who answered the questionnaire did not complete all of the questions. The construction of some questions made data reduction and subsequent analyses of the efficacy of YTEP difficult. For example: questions concerning length of stay in YTEP were ambiguous; family and client incomes were merged making determination of the marginal income increment after YTEP difficult; and answers containing only partial information invalidated others.

The qualitative questions were not useful in conducting quantitative analysis. We do not suggest that attitudinal responses have no value, but we do suggest that their interpretation is dependent on myriad sociological, psychological and emotional considerations. One is often at a loss to attribute them to internal effects of YTEP or external societal effects.

A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE TOTAL YTEP POPULATION AND THE QUESTIONNAIRE SAMPLE

We previously indicated that the OEO funded Rand study involved interviews with a random sample of YTEP clients, and that only 229 of the original sample of 501 completed questionnaires. In our examina-

tion of these data, we felt that it was important to determine the representativeness of the sample.

To make such a determination, we compared information from the total YTEP population of 7,689 with the sample using both data from the YTEP files and the questionnaire.

Comparison of Age at Entry

The age at entry to YTEP of 6,465 clients is compared with the sample by using information obtained from the YTEP file:

Population: Average age at entry, $\mu = 18.38$ years with a standard deviation, $\sigma = 1.56$ years

Sample: Average age at entry, $\bar{\chi} = 17.8$ years

If the sample was representative of the population we would expect the sample mean to approach the population mean. However, a statistical test of the means show we would expect a sample mean this low:

$$z = \frac{18.38 - 17.8}{\frac{1.56}{\sqrt{229}}} = 5.63$$

less than .0001 percent of the time!

We further examined the distribution of age at entry.

Table 1

Age Entered YTEP

Age (Years)	Population	Sample	Expected	Contribution to χ^2 Value
15.99 or less	145	7	5.0	.764
16 - 16.99	1107	55	39.2	6.41
17 - 17.99	1483	64	52.7	2.44
18 - 18.99	1621	56	57.5	.04
19 - 19.99	1112	24	39.4	6.01
20 - 20.99	665	17	23.5	1.84
21 or more	332	6	11.7	2.76

A chi-square test of these two distributions yields $\chi^2 = 20.26$ with 6 degrees of freedom, which shows a significant (.005 level) difference of the sample distribution.

We make the obvious conclusion that the sample is significantly different from the population by being substantially younger. The cause for this disparity is less obvious. We submit the following two hypotheses: (1) Mobility increases with age; therefore, the group that was younger at entry had the greatest probability of being located for the interview; (2) the age of clients entering YTEP is decreasing over time. This is possible since the sample was drawn from June 1966 to June 1967 while the population covers September 1963 to September 1968.

To test the second hypotheses we drew a random sample of 250 clients from June 1966 to June 1967. The resulting mean age at entry for this sample was, $\bar{\chi} = 18.25$. We expect a sample mean this low, if age is not decreasing over time,

$$z = \frac{18.38 - 18.25}{\frac{1.56}{\sqrt{250}}} = 1.32$$

about 9.4 percent of the time--not nearly as significant as the questionnaire sample. We feel that this additional evidence tends to support the first hypothesis over the second.

We conclude that the questionnaire sample is biased because age at entry is significantly younger than the population. We consider this a serious deficiency since 146 of the original 501 randomly selected clients could not be located. This should be kept in mind when interpreting the results of later sections!

Comparison of the Number of Services Provided by YTEP

We used the YTEP file to determine the number of services provided by YTEP to the population and to the sample. "Services" are divided into three broad categories: (1) Subsidization - including participation in NYC or OJT, or the Manpower Development Training Act (MDTA);

(2) Training - including participation in basic skills, pre-vocational and vocational training classes; and (3) Job referral.

Population: Average number of services, $\mu = 1.29$ with a standard deviation of $\sigma = 1.66$

Sample: Average number of services, $\bar{\chi} = 1.5$

We expect to obtain a sample mean this high:

$$z = \frac{1.5 - 1.29}{\frac{1.66}{\sqrt{229}}} = 1.91$$

about 3 percent of the time. It appears that the sample received more services than the population. The distribution of services is indicated in Table 2.

Table 2

Number of YTEP Services Provided

Number of Services	Population	Sample	Expected	Contribution to χ^2 Value
0	3471	85	103.3	3.24
1	1599	50	47.6	.12
2	1197	38	35.5	.18
3	638	30	19.0	6.36
4	344	11	10.3	.05
5	227	9	6.8	.66
6 or more	196	6	5.7	.01

A chi-square comparison of these two distributions yields, $\chi^2 = 10.6$ with 6 degrees of freedom. This is not significant at the .1 level.

We conclude that there is insufficient evidence to support the hypothesis that the sample received a different number of services than the population. However, the sample shows a tendency toward a greater number of services.

Comparison of Classes Attended

As an item of interest, we show the number of questionnaire respondents who said they attended classes and contrast that with the same information obtained for the sample from the YTEP files.

Table 3

Number of Clients Who Attended Classes

	From YTEP Files	Response of those same individuals from questionnaire
Attended classes	86	67 said they did 19 said they did not
Did not attend	143	26 said they did 117 said they did not

We do not know whether to attribute these discrepancies, which occur in 19.6 percent of the cases, to faulty memory or a misconception of what classes are. Whatever the reason, it disturbs one's confidence in the questionnaire.

Comparison of Length of Stay in YTEP

The YTEP file contained dates of enrollment and completion for 4701 of the 7689 clients. The low percentage of available data was discussed in the previous section and was attributed to poor recordkeeping in the early years of YTEP.

For those clients with completed dates (all data from YTEP),

Population: average length of stay, $\mu = 323$ days with a standard deviation, $\sigma = 285$ days for 4701 clients

Sample: average length of stay, $\bar{X} = 247$ for 174 clients

We would expect a sample mean this low:

$$z = \frac{323 - 247}{\frac{285}{\sqrt{174}}} = 3.52$$

less than .02 percent of the time.

Table 4

Length of Stay in YTEP

Days	Population	Sample	Expected	Contribution to χ^2
48 or less	414	8	15.3	3.49
49 - 90	397	18	14.6	.78
91 - 132	477	23	17.57	1.68
133 - 174	432	16	16.01	.00
175 - 216	373	17	13.75	.77
217 - 258	355	23	13.22	7.23
259 - 300	276	10	10.27	.01
301 - 342	294	14	10.96	.84
343 - 384	227	14	8.35	3.82
385 - 426	199	8	7.31	.07
427 - 468	167	6	6.26	.01
469 - 510	137	5	5.05	.00
511 - 532	137	5	5.05	.00
553 or more	816	7	30.27	17.89

A chi-square comparison of the sample and the population yields $\chi^2 = 36.6$ with 13 degrees of freedom. This is significant at the .001 level.

From this evidence, one would conclude that the sample had a much shorter stay in YTEP than did the population. This may be true but we are skeptical of this result because 442 clients (almost 10 percent) were recorded as having spent more than two years in YTEP. We even observed several cases where the length of stay was almost four years. These were mainly for clients entering YTEP in 1963. For clients later in the file (post-1965) we did not observed these long lengths of stay. Note that in the above table the last cell contributes the most to the chi-square value.

We conclude that this difference between population and sample should be attributed to poor early recordkeeping.

This variable is quite interesting and we investigated the sample further. In 149 cases the questionnaires used in the interviews contained

sufficient information to obtain the length of stay in YTEP. We performed a least-squares regression between the length of stay in YTEP obtained from the file as the dependent variable and that from the questionnaire as the independent variable. We were interested in seeing if they are related and, if so, the nature of the relationship.

The results were: $Y = 202.7 + .339X$ with an $r^2 = .08$ and a t statistic of 3.6 which is significant at the .001 level.

We noted an interesting phenomon when examining the data. Many clients indicated they spent less than three days, while the file showed they spent considerably more time in YTEP. For these clients we checked if they had received any services, particularly NYC. In several instances they had. This is consistent with P. Katsky's contention that clients enrolled in NYC felt they had a job referral and were no longer in YTEP, while YTEP considers NYC a legitimate service and continues to carry the client as enrolled. We excluded these points and several similar ones and re-ran the regression with the results: $Y = 172 + .5X$ for 138 samples $r^2 = .25$ and a t statistic of 6.55.

This result, while not fully satisfying, indicates three important points: (1) there appears to be a lag at YTEP between the time a client leaves and the date his record is closed out, which averages about 6 months; (2) there is a definite, but weak, relation between the respondent's recollection of how long he was in training and the YTEP record; and (3) the tendency appears to be that memory understates the length in the program (coefficient is less than 1).

We feel the relationship, while significant, is weak. We attribute this weakness primarily, to the respondent's memory (30 percent of the respondents indicated round dates such as one, two, or three months). In further use of the "length of stay in YTEP" variable we will use the YTEP file dates rather than the respondent's memory, except in cases where the questionnaire was the only information available.

Conclusions and Recommendations

We conclude that the sample is not very representative of the entire YTEP population from 1963 through 1968, being biased mainly by age. We further conclude that the quality of data, both for the questionnaire and the file, leaves the investigator with very weak results and severely restricts his ability to make positive statements. The use of questionnaires for collecting data is a questionable tool for evaluating poverty programs. The inability to locate a large proportion of the sample immediately introduces bias into an analysis.

Data collected by YTEP leaves much to be desired. However, there is evidence that the collection system is improving with time.

Since good data are required to successfully evaluate poverty programs in a quantitative manner, we make the following suggestions:

(1) That poverty programs have data collection systems installed from their beginning rather than merely evolving.

(2) That quality control procedures be instituted to insure that the collection systems are properly administered.

These suggestions may seem to be self-serving for the data analyst, and might cause the objection to be made that all of the scarce poverty program funds should be spent on providing services rather than on collecting data. Our response is that to insure the most efficient allocation of funds, evaluation tools must be applied. Without adequate data, meaningful evaluation is impossible and without evaluation you cannot be sure that the programs are not providing benefits which do not justify the costs required.

SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

The questionnaire indicates that the client's average age was 19.13 at the time of the interview. The complete age distribution is found in Table 5.

Table 5

Client's Age at Time of Interview

Age	Number
≤ 15	2
16	8
17	41
18	64
19	58
20	29
21	17
22	8
≥ 23	2
	229

Only 16 percent of our sample was married and only 9 percent had children. Only two girls in the sample had to care for children without the benefit of a husband.

The sample group is surprisingly well educated. The median years of schooling is 11, and 29 percent of the sample completed high school.

Table 6

What Was Last Grade Completed in School?

Grade	Male	Female	Total
< 5	5	2	7
5	1	1	2
6	1	5	6
7	1	0	1
8	0	0	0
9	11	8	19
10	28	30	58
11	47	21	68

Table 6 (continued)

Grade	Male	Female	Total
12	29	35	64
13	2	0	2
14	1	1	2
> 14	0	0	0
	126	103	229

The income of households where the clients reside is interesting because YTEP attempts to serve poor people. The average annual income per household, as indicated by the client, is $5,150, and 25 percent had incomes greater than $6,000. However, these figures include the earnings of the client after YTEP participation. These were presumably not available prior to his participating in the program. When these earnings are subtracted, the average annual earnings per household is $3,760. Since data on the number living in the households were not available, it is impossible to evaluate this income in terms of the legal (Orshansky) definition of poverty. However, it is low enough to indicate that many of the clients satisfied that criteria.

A series of questions dealt with the services provided by YTEP: 42 percent of the sample had been referred to a job by YTEP; 78 percent of the sample remembered receiving counseling; while 40 percent said they had attended classes.

Reasons why clients stopped attending YTEP classes are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Why Stopped Attending YTEP Classes

Does not apply or did not answer	180
Childbirth	2
Of no use	4
Finished classes	14

Table 7 (continued)

Needed more extensive training	3
Did not like	4
Got a job	11
Went back to school	2
Got married	1
Other	8

Of the 49 who answered this question, only 14 (24 percent) finished the classes. Eleven of the 49 quit for reasons which implied that the classes were not beneficial to them. However, 44 other people who started classes did not indicate why they stopped.

Another set of questions ascertained follow-up data on what the clients were currently doing. Thirty-three were still officially in YTEP. Of the remainder, 101 were working, and 11 had returned to school.

We compared these statistics to those of a similar group that did not attend YTEP. The *DOL News* provides statistics for people 16-19 years of age from the East LA and Watts areas. Although it does not separate Mexican-American, it gives data on a white/non-white basis. The white labor force participation rate for this age group is 58.2, for non-white it is 59.5. The white unemployment rate is 25.9, for non-white it is 31.6. Since over-all statistics indicate that Negroes have a higher rate of unemployment than Mexican-Americans and that other whites have a lower rate, we have estimated the Mexican-American figures to be the average of the two. The labor force participation is defined as either being employed or actively looking for work. Since fewer in our group are in school than is normal for the ages included, it has a much higher participation rate.

Table 8

16-19 Year-Olds in the Labor Force

	Estimate for Mexican-American Youths 16-19 years	YTEP Sample
Labor force participation rate	58.8	79.3
Unemployment rate	28.6	33.7

If one drew a random sample of 182 (the number in our sample who participate in the labor force) from a binomial with p = .286, he would expect values as extreme as .337 almost 30 percent of the time. Therefore, we have no reason to believe that after YTEP participation the YTEP clients have either a harder or easier time securing a job than their peers who do not attend YTEP.

It has been suggested that the Mexican-American culture did not motivate females to find a job, and that they used YTEP merely as a respectable place to go while they waited for the "right man." The employment rate seen in our sample (Table 9) shows no significant difference between sexes, using a χ^2 with 1 degree of freedom.

Table 9

Are You Currently Working?

	Male	Female	
Yes	62	50	112
No	64	52	116
	126	102	228

III. DETERMINING HOW PARTICIPATING IN YTEP CORRELATES WITH SUCCESS

THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES

We ran binary probability regressions to determine how several variables correlated with success. We defined success in two ways:

(1) Working at the time of the interview.

(2) Working, or being in school or being married (for females) at the time of the interview.

Working was determined to be the key measure of success because it is, after all, the primary goal of YTEP to train youths for work and to help them find jobs. We decided that holding any job was a success regardless of the amount the job paid. We reached this conclusion for two reasons. First, because in terms of the program's goals, being employed at even a menial job is better than not being employed. Second, we found that most of the salaries earned were within a fairly narrow range (typically from $1.40 to $2.00 per hour), and we felt that it was not accurate to say that a youth earning $1.70 per hour was more successful than a youth earning $1.50 per hour because the youth earning the lower salary may have a better opportunity for advancement or have a more secure job.

A second ingredient in one of our measures of success, being in school, was used since the program theoretically accepts only youths who are out of school without having graduated. We decided that a youth who returned to school or enrolled in a training program was moving in "the right direction," because additional training or education might lead to a well-paying job.

Finally, we used marriage in the case of females as an ingredient because this could quite conceivably represent an escape from poverty conditions and the attainment of her personal goals. This is certainly the most debatable of our criteria for success because it could represent a number of other things such as getting married because of

pregnancy or marrying a youth of a similar, poor, unemployed status. She might still desire to work but be unable to.

THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Our goal was to build a model to explain what constitutes success for YTEP clients. We used combinations of the following independent variables to explain our two sets of success measures. These right-hand-side variables included personal characteristics (control variables) and information regarding services provided by YTEP (explanatory variables) which were obtained from the available data. Unfortunately, substantial attitudinal information (control variable), which we felt would correlate with success, was not available. Control variables enable the effect of individual characteristics to be held constant so that the effect of the explanatory variables can be observed.

Our control variables included:

- Age - because we felt it may be easier for older clients to find work than younger ones for a variety of reasons such as the fact that insurance is not obtainable for younger people and that employers may equate age with maturity and strength. We used age at last birthday except for 16 and 17 year-olds who were given a value of 16.5 because we felt that employers did not differentiate between them but did between them and 15 year-olds and between them and 18 year-olds.
- Marriage - because having this responsibility may make a youth more inclined to seek work and to hold a job when he gets one and because he may appear more stable to an employer. This variable is assigned a value of one if married, zero otherwise.
- Degree of Mexican origin (that is, the number of the youth's parents that were born in Mexico) - because it is believed to be a proxy for cultural assimilation. We hypothesize that a youth with one or two Mexican-born parents would not

be as likely to have assimilated the language and culture of this country as one with parents who were born and raised in this country. This variable was assigned the value of one if one parent was born in Mexico, two if both were and zero if neither was.

- Number of criminal convictions - because employers are reluctant to hire people with a criminal record and because it may serve as a proxy for anti-social attitudes or psychological problems.
- Amount of education (that is, the highest grade attended to the 2.5 power) - because we felt that each additional year of education contributed more to the ability to be employed than the previous year. This exponent was determined through huristic reasoning.
- Whether the youth had ever been employed before attending YTEP - because this might indicate either a capability or a predisposition for working or both. This variable was given a value of one if a youth had been employed and zero if not.

Our YTEP treatment (explanatory) variables included:

- Total number of services provided by YTEP - as a measure of the total effect of YTEP.
- Number of times the youth was enrolled in NYC, OJT and MDTA - The following three variables were used to measure the effect of each of these services.
- Number of classes (training) - As previously indicated, YTEP services were of three types (subsidized programs, training and job referral).
- Number of jobs that were found for the youth by YTEP
- Whether the youth stated that he received counseling from YTEP - This variable was given a value of one if yes and zero if not.

- Whether the youth was subsidized for attending YTEP (through a variety of programs such as OJT, MDTA, and NYC) - because a youth who would go through the training program without receiving any support may have a stronger desire to work and hence may be more likely to succeed than one who was subsidized. This variable was given a value of one if yes, zero if not.

- Length of stay in YTEP - because this should have a positive effect in the same manner as the number of services received would, and could be a proxy for the social, motivational and psychological impact on the client. This variable was expressed in days.

- Length of time since the youth last attended YTEP - because Pat Katsky had found it significant. This variable was expressed in days.

- Whether the youth felt that the YTEP experience had been beneficial - to test whether a perception of success by the client is related to his succeeding. This variable was given a value of one if yes and zero if not.

Our model assumes that the probability of a particular individual achieving success is a function of the independent variables.

IV. RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

Section III described the variables we investigated for the existence of relationships and discussed the model used to test these relationships. This section interprets the results in Tables 10 and 11, using the model and variables discussed above.

Although some of these relationships are not significant, all are included because much that we conclude is based on the pattern of significance obtained over all relationships rather than just from the ones that have low probability of occurring by chance. The best of these relations (Nos. 6, 7, 11, 12-18) exhibit probabilities of from 2 to 17 percent of having occurred by chance. Although we consider these significant we also admit that they are weak. While they are not useful for predicting the success of one individual at the beginning of YTEP, they are useful for demonstrating which variables have the greatest effect.

The regressions in Table 10 are all modeled using working, in-school, or married (women only) at the time of the interview as a measure of success. The regressions models in Table 11 use only working at the time of interview as the success measure.

VARIABLES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO SUCCESS

Age at Time of Interview

This variable was significant* or near significant in 7 of the 26 total regressions. This evidence is too mixed to conclude that age significantly contributes to the client's chances of success. We reiterate the conclusions that were indicated in Section II: the sample we are working with is highly biased by age and is younger than the YTEP population as a whole. An unbiased sample might lead to a very different conclusion about this variable.

*Significant variable--probability of 10 percent or less that we would have observed the non-zero coefficient if in fact it was zero.

Table 10
Relation of Variables to Success

Equation # (χ^2)	#4 Age	#5 Sex	#6 Education$^{2.5}$	#7 # of Convictions	#8 Married	#9 Mexican parents	#10 Since YTEP	#11 Worked before YTEP	#12 Duration	#13 Subsidized	#14 # of Services	#15 # of JD's	#16 NYC	#17 Classes	#18 Counseling	#19 YTEP useful	#20 Duration (from questionnaire)	Constant
1. .65	.039 S(.00)		.0007 S(.05)			.164 N		-0.30 N	.0015 S(.01)			.135 N	.032 N	.172 N				-.899 S(0.00)
2. .50	.041 S(00)		.0007 S(.05)			.174 N		-.299 N	.0015 S(.01)		.104 N							-.942 S(.000)
3. .25	.014 S(.07)	.634 S(.000)	.0007 S(.05)					-.245 N	.0013 S(.02)	-.119 N		.092 N		.194 N				-1.146 S(.000)
4. .23	.015 S(.05)	.626 S(.000)	.0006 S(.07)					-.26 N	.0013 S(.02)	-.283 N	.140 S(.06)							-1.125 S(.000)
5. .50	.054 S(.000)		.0012 S(.000)			.144 N		-.26 N			.096 N						.0015 N(.11)	-1.19 S(.000)
6. .04	.010 N	.664 S(.000)	.0007 S(.08)						.0012 S(.03)		.056 N				.008 N	.399 S(.000)		-1.55 S(.000)
7. .02	-.003 N	.700 S(.000)	.0007 S(.07)				.0016 S(.003)		.002 S(.000)		.042 N					.432 S(.000)		-1.906 S(.000)
12. .10	.006 N	.737 S(.000)	.0007 S(.04)															-.92 S(.000)
13. .10	.001 N	.692 S(.000)	.0006 N(.12)						.0013 S(.01)									-.975 S(.000)
14. .11	-.004 N	.689 S(.000)	.0006 S(.09)				.0012 S(.02)		.0018 S(.001)		.068 N							-1.34 S(.000)
15. .10	-.0097 N	.717 S(.000)	.0006 N(.11)				.0013 S(.02)		.0020 S(.002)									-1.24 S(.000)
16. .05		.713 S(.000)	.0005 N(.15)				.0013 S(.02)		.0020 S(.002)									
17. .10	.0010 N	.692 S(.000)	.0006 N(.12)						.0013 S(.01)									
18. .05		.692 S(.000)	.0006 N(.12)						.0013 S(.01)									

Table 11
Relation of Variables to Working

Equation	#4 Age	#5 Sex	#6 Education	#7 # of Convictions	#8 Married	#9 Mexican parents	#10, Time since YTEP	#11, Worked before YTEP	#12 Duration	#13 Subsidized	#14 Services	#15 JD	#16 NYC	#17 Classes	#18 Counseling	#19 YTEP Useful	Constant
8. .25	.0016 N		.0010 S(.003)				.0010 S(.06)		.0012 S(.02)		-.05 N				.24 N	.37 S(.000)	-1.34 S(.000)
9. .95	.0112 N	-.051 N	.0009 S(.01)					-.22 N	-.0010 S(.05)	-.103 N		.179 N		-.110 N			-.495 S(.000)
10. .40	.0100 N	-.571 N	.0010 S(.004)						.0008 S(.10)		.043 N				.252 N	.349 S(.001)	-1.1 S(.000)
20. .90	.012 N(.106)	-.008 N	.0012 S(.001)														-.61 S(.000)
21. .80	.0092 N	-.039 N	.0010 S(.002)						.0008 N(.11)								-.65 S(.000)
22. .75	.0073 N		.0011 S(.002)						.0008 N(.12)								-.67 S(.0000)
23. .75	.0116 N(.12)		.0012 S(.001)														-.62 S(.000)
24. .75	.0028 N		.0010 S(.003)	-.361 N					.0008 N(.11)								-.52 .0001
25. .50			.0011 S(.001)						.0008 N(.12)								-.54 S(.0001)
26. .50			.0012 S(.0004)														

Sex

This variable is significant in all the relations of Table 10. However, it is not significant in the relations of Table 11. Since success in Table 10 is partially defined by being a married female, we conclude that this indicates that being female contributes heavily to being a married female; however, it does not appear to be important in obtaining work.

Education

Education was positive and significant, or near significant, in all relations. That is not surprising and should point to further emphasis by YTEP in encouraging clients to return to school.

Time Since YTEP

This variable was significant and positive in all relations in which it was entered. We feel this should be interpreted as meaning that the longer one is out of YTEP the more chances he has of finding work or going back to school. It is also possible that it is acting to some extent as a proxy for age.

Length of Stay in YTEP

This variable was positive and highly significant in all the relations of Table 10 for which it was entered. All other YTEP variables such as number of services or counselling were not significant. The indication of its significance is very strong, and is somewhat puzzling since the other YTEP variable showed no sign of being important at all. We feel that YTEP contributes to the success of its clients but cannot state why with assurance. We speculate that one or both of the following situations are the case:

(1) The variables selected to describe YTEP activities are not valuable in describing how the services actually benefit the client. Therefore, duration in YTEP is acting as a proxy for all services.

(2) YTEP's contribution to the client is entirely in the psychological and motivational realm. Just being around people who wish to help, and others who are seeking help, changes the feelings of the client and increases the desire to work or return to school.

We are disturbed that we cannot attribute YTEP's positive effect to specific parts of the program. Our models are useless for determining which aspects of YTEP should be emphasized and provide no information for the decisionmaker to use in determining how resources should be allocated.

Future research should concentrate on gathering data to measure the effect of the specific YTEP services. Such measures would include the following, among others: number of hours of instruction, number of hours of counselling, medical treatment provided, number and length of motivational services.

Client's Perception of the Benefit of YTEP

Regressions 6 and 7 of Table 10 and 8 and 10 of Table 11 were constructed using the clients' perception of YTEP as a variable. We ran these not to test the variable as a control or explanation device but to test the hypothesis that clients who succeed attribute their success to YTEP.

The variable is positive and highly significant in these relations. So it appears that the clients themselves see YTEP as useful when they succeed and not useful when they do not succeed. Which again suggests the usefulness of YTEP but provides no specific reasons and also tends to support the definitions of success we have used. We hasten to add that the significance of this variable may be the result of a "halo effect"; that is, successful clients might answer positively to any questions concerning any forces which might have contributed to their success.

All other variables outlined in Section III were tried in the regressions in Tables 10 and 11 or in some preliminary regressions and found to be non-significant.

CONCLUSIONS

We conclude that clients with the greatest amount of education, spending the longest amount of time enrolled in YTEP have the highest probability of achieving success.

The conclusions throughout this section have been described in qualitative terms, because the logrithmic nature of the logit model makes it difficult to interpret the quantitative value of the coefficients.

The models are not simple linear combinations of variables as with least squares regressions. Quantitative statements could be made by re-transforming the variables but this would be pointless for these models since, out of all the explanatory variables, only length of stay was significant. We have no information regarding any of the components of YTEP that contribute to the significance of this variable. Therefore, the worth of a day in YTEP could be a meaningless measure.

We again point out that the sample we are analyzing might be biased; we have no control group and the relationships we have obtained through the logit representation are weak. Our results should be treated as indications and background for future research rather than predictive of success of YTEP clients.

V. SUMMARY

The objectives of this study were to provide a profile of YTEP clients and to determine how YTEP participation correlates with success later achieved by the client.

Part of the data used in our study was obtained by a questionnaire given to former YTEP clients. This questionnaire indicates the following characteristics for YTEP clients: The average age is slightly over 19 years. Only 16 percent were married and only 9 percent of those had children. They are surprisingly well educated, or at least spent more time in school than would be expected for poverty-level individuals, as the median attended the eleventh grade and 29 percent completed high school. The average household income was $3,760 after the client's post-YTEP income was subtracted. Since this income was presumably not available prior to attending YTEP, clients are poor in terms of the legal (Orshansky) definition of poverty!

We used a logit regression model to determine the relation of several independent variables with success (our dependent variable) which we defined in two ways: One was working and the other was working or being in school or being married in the case of females.

We obtained the following indications on the relevance of independent variables to explain success.

- Age at time of interview was significant, or nearly significant, in many of the regressions. However, evidence is too mixed to conclude that age significantly contributes to the client's chances of success.
- Sex is apparently unimportant for these clients in obtaining work.
- Education was positive and significant, or near significant, in all relationships.
- The time since the youth last attended YTEP was also significant in all relationships. This should be interpreted as

meaning the longer one is out of YTEP the more chance he has of finding work or going back to school. However, it is also possible that it is acting to some extent as a proxy for age.

- Length of stay in YTEP was positive and highly significant in all of the relationships in which it was entered. However, all other variables selected to describe the impact of YTEP on clients were not significant. This indicates that YTEP contributes to the success of its clients but we cannot state why with assurance, although we speculate that one or both of the following is the case:

  (1) That other variables selected to describe YTEP activities are of no value in describing what the services actually contribute to the client; therefore, duration in YTEP is acting as a proxy for all services.

  (2) That YTEP's contribution to the client is entirely in the psychological and motivational realm.

Our models provide only indications about the nature of YTEP and its clients. They are of little value in determining which aspect of YTEP should be emphasized and our confidence in the above results is limited to some extent because the sample that responded to the questionnaire was not representative. Responses to the questionnaire were obtained from less than half of the selected random sample. The responding group is significantly different from the total population by being substantially younger. We hypothesize that this happened because mobility increases with age. The inability to locate a large proportion of a sample introduces bias into an analysis and severely restricts the ability of the analyst to make strong statements.

The questionnaire technique suffers several shortcomings as an instrument for evaluating manpower programs. In addition to the problem of locating those included in the sample, there are problems such as the client forgetting factual data or providing a rough estimate for data that could be precisely determined by other means. Also, the client may have a misconception about what information is sought. For example, a large number of clients who participated in YTEP's NYC

component apparently assumed that their affiliation with YTEP had terminated.

In addition to the problems of getting accurate data, the questionnaire is a very expensive instrument to administer. The minimum cost for this type of questionnaire was estimated at about $40 per observation.*

We recommend that poverty programs have their own data collection systems and that quality control procedures be instituted to insure that these systems are properly administered. This should assure the availability of more accurate data for program evaluations.

While the over-all quality of YTEP data (1963-1968) is considered to be marginal, it has improved greatly over time; in the most recent year of the file, ages and start dates were available for 99 percent of the clients compared to 85 percent for the entire file. More comprehensive information has been included in the YTEP data collected since 1968, including: sex, race, birthplace, citizenship, physical and emotional characteristics, family characteristics, family income, and conviction record; aptitude and intelligence test, scores and counseling profile are now available.

---

*RM-5740-OEO, *Employees and Manpower Training Programs: Data Collection and Analysis*, D. H. Greenberg, October 1968